

**REMARKS**

None of the claims have been amended or cancelled. Claims 1-13 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1 and 8 are the independent claims. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Benson Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,375).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a double-sided light emitting device comprising: lower and upper substrates; an emission element formed between an inner surface of the upper substrate and an inner surface of the lower substrate and emitting predetermined light; an upper layer of polarizing material disposed on at least one of inner and outer surfaces of the upper substrate; and a lower layer of polarizing material disposed on at least one of inner and outer surfaces of the lower substrate, wherein the upper and lower layers of polarizing material are disposed so that polarization axes of the upper and lower layers of polarizing material are perpendicular to each other.

The Office Action relies on Benson for the teachings of claim 1 and in particular in Fig. 10, column 14, lines 6-48.

However, a careful review of the figures and the reference reveals the Benson does not teach or suggest the novel features for which it is relied upon for at least the following reasons.

Benson discloses a lamp 310 including a front layer 312 comprising a multilayer optical film reflective polarizer and a back reflector 320 comprising a totally reflective multilayer optical film to reflect light towards the front surface of the electroluminescent lamp 310 (column 14, lines 6-16). Benson further discloses that the electroluminescent lamp 310 includes a layer 316 including an electroluminescent phosphor material (column 14, lines 17-24).

Accordingly, Benson simply discloses a lamp including a front layer 312 comprising a multilayer optical film reflective polarizer, an electroluminescent material 316, and a back layer or back reflector 320 comprising a totally reflective multilayer optical film.

In other words, Benson discloses, at most, a lower layer including a polarizing material

312, a layer including an emission material 316, and a totally reflective upper layer 320.

Benson however, makes no reference or suggestion of the upper layer 320 including a polarizing material, as recited in independent claim 1.

Furthermore, even if the back reflector or upper layer 320 were to include a polarizing material, Benson still fails to teach or suggest that the front layer 312 and the back layer 320 have polarization axes perpendicular to each other.

Furthermore, Applicants note that claim 1 recites a double-sided light emitting device, while Benson simply teaches a bottom emission or a top emission type organic light emitting device. Therefore, claim 1 relates to a double-faced organic light emitting device capable of preventing deterioration of the definition of the image quality caused by external light.

However, back reflector 320 of Benson is used to reflect light towards the front surface of the electroluminescent lamp 310 (column 14, lines 14-16). Thus, the electroluminescent lamp 310 of Benson does not emit light towards the back reflector 320. Accordingly, the electroluminescent lamp 310 of Benson is not a double-faced organic light emitting device, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Benson fails to teach or suggest, at least, these novel features of independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 8, it is noted that this claim recites some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejection of this claim is also traversed for similar reasons as set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of dependent claims 3, 7, 9 and 13, it is noted that these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 8 and are therefore allowable, at least, because of their dependency from claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 2, 4-6, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,375), of record

Regarding the rejection of dependent claims 2, 4-6 and 10-12, it is noted that these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 8 and as noted above, Benson does not teach or suggest the novel features recited in the independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 4-6 and 10-12 are allowable, at least, because of their dependency from claims 1 and 8, and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 7/17/08

By: Douglas X. Rodriguez  
Douglas X. Rodriguez  
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510